

REMARKSRestriction Requirement:

The restriction requirement has been made final. Thus, claims 23-38 and 43-50 have been withdrawn. Because the requirement for restriction is final, the Applicant may petition the Commissioner to review the restriction requirement. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.144, the Applicant reserves the right to defer petitioning until after a final action on or allowance of claims to the invention elected.

Specification:

The Examiner has indicated that a new title is required. As such, the title has been amended as indicated in the Amendments to the Specification section.

Claim Rejections:Kan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,541,705)

Claims 1, 10-15 and are alleged to be anticipated by Kan et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). As amended, independent claim 1 calls for identifying a bright light source in incident light, identifying a direction of sight of a receptor, and adjusting the opacity of a first plurality of cells of a matrix when the direction of sight is within an active zone, the direction of sight being within the active zone when the direction of sight approaches the bright light source.

It is respectfully submitted that Kan does not teach determining a relationship between a bright light source and the direction in which the camera is pointed. As such, Kan does not teach an active zone. In some embodiments, to determine when the direction of sight is within the active zone or approaches the bright light source, the bright light source may be identified and the direction of sight may be identified. Thus, when the direction of sight is within the active zone, the opacity of a first plurality of cells in a matrix is adjusted.

In contrast, Kan simply attenuates areas of intense light while allowing areas of dim light to pass unattenuated regardless of the relationship between the camera and the bright light source. Column 2, lines 8-10; column 3, line 3. Generally, Kan passes light through lenses and

polarizers before the light impinges upon a light valve. Figure 6. In this way, the image may be spread over the light valve to increase its resistance to light impulses. Column 4, lines 11-24. However, Kan makes no mention of specifically identifying the source of the intense light and identifying the direction the camera is pointing in. Thus, Kan does not teach attenuating intense light based on the relationship between the camera and the intense light source. Accordingly, Kan does not anticipate independent claim 1. Moreover, claim 10 depends from claim 1; therefore, Kan does not anticipate claim 10.

As amended, independent claim 11 calls for a matrix disposed between a light deflector and a receptor, the matrix comprising a plurality of cells, wherein the opacity of each of the cells may selectively be adjusted. It is respectfully submitted that Kan does not teach disposing a matrix between a light deflector and the receptor. Rather, Kan disposes his beamsplitter 5 between a light controller 3 and a receiving camera 7. See Figures 1 and 2. Thus, Kan does not anticipate claim 11. Further, claims 12-15 and 22 depend from claim 11. Thus, claims 12-15 and 22 are also not anticipated by Kan.

Barnes (U.S. Patent 5,671,035)

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Barnes.

As amended, independent claim 1 calls for receiving incident light into a beamsplitter, and refracting part of the incident light to a sensor. It is respectfully submitted that Barnes does not teach or suggest the utilization of a beamsplitter. Thus, Barnes does not anticipate independent claim 1. Further, claims 2-4 and 7 depend from independent claim 1. Thus, Barnes does not anticipate claims 2-4 and 7.

Independent claim 39 calls for receiving light intensity information from a sensor where the sensor is in a plane different from the plane of a shading matrix. In contrast, Barnes teaches LCD lenses 4 and 5 wherein each LCD lens contains a sensor array 6 or 7 with associated photosensors 10 and 11 respectively. Further, LCD lenses 4 and 5 also include shutter matrices 8 and 9 respectively. Thus, the sensors and the matrices lie in the same plane; the plane of the

LCD lenses 4 and 5. As such, Barnes does not anticipate independent claim 39. Because claims 40-42 depend from claim 39, they are not anticipated by Barnes.

New Claims:

New claims 51-54 are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

As amended, neither Kan nor Barnes anticipates independent claims 1, 11 and 39. Thus, neither Kan nor Barnes anticipates the claims depending there from. Further, there is no reason to combine Kan with Barnes. For example, Barnes would not be inclined to use a beamsplitter due to the positioning of his sensors, photodetectors and matrices, as previously explained.

New claims 51-54 are believed to be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's prompt attention in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

James M. Cate
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,181
281/483-1001

NASA Johnson Space Center
Mail Code HA
Houston, TX 77058
FAX 281-244-8452